

that little heart. And to think of that little heart struggling for life; to think of that baby squirming to try to avoid the abortionist; to think of that baby feeling the pain; to think of that baby being aborted because the mother or the father wanted a boy or a girl; or because somebody told them that that baby wasn't going to be exactly perfect, none of that measures up against innocent, unborn human life, sacred life, that life that we have to protect from the moment of conception to natural death.

That is what is wrapped up in this heartbeat bill. And if we had the science to prove the moment of conception, I would be standing here with a moment of conception bill. We don't have that science today, but we do have the science of detecting a heartbeat.

And we know the sound of a beating heart is the sound of life. And if you can detect a heartbeat, if you can hear that heart beating in any of us, you know that person is alive; you know there is a spirit within us; you know that our soul is still within our body; and you know that there is a hope for us—at least whoever that might be whose heart we are listening to—to get up and to move about, to live, love, laugh, learn, reproduce, and contribute, to glorify this Earth in a way that we are challenged to do.

Yet, 60 million babies have been denied that opportunity and have been denied that gift of life.

What might they have done? What might they have done for America? What might they have done for the world? How many Presidents, how many Mother Teresas, how many Billy Grahams? How many people have lost their life before they ever had a chance to breathe and fight for it that might have solved the problems that we are facing today here in this United States Congress?

We can't deny that potential. We carry that guilt today, but the best we can do is end it as soon as we can end it. And we would end 90 to 95 percent of the abortions in America with H.R. 490 the Heartbeat Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind you here in this Congress that this is a bill that has strong support in the polling that we have rolled out here. Eighty-six percent of Republicans say that if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby should be protected. Fifty-five percent of Democrats agree that if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. Sixty-one percent of Independents say that if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. And of those who oppose it—at least those who oppose it vigorously—only 6 percent of Republicans, 25 percent of Democrats—and I am going to suspect that a fair amount of these 25 percent of Democrats, Mr. Speaker, are more for political reasons and that they wouldn't be able to sustain themselves in a moral debate on the topic. I think that may or may not be the case for the 27 percent of no parties.

But to put this back into summary, Mr. Speaker, here are easier numbers to remember: 69 percent of the American people, with only a 3.1 percent margin of error, believe that if a heartbeat can be detected, the baby is protected. That is 7 in 10 Americans that take that stand. And that is one of the strongest pieces of support you can get for any bill that would ever come to this floor or any discussion that we ever have if you get up to that level of 7 out of 10, and only 18 percent disagree vigorously.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the people that listen in on this conversation between us have contemplated the central points that I have put into this debate and this discussion here this evening, and I hope they have thought about the principles that are involved. I hope they are able to carry this message along to their children and grandchildren, and into our schools and our classrooms, our churches and our synagogues all across this land, this profound belief that if Americans share; that we believe that human life is sacred and it needs to be then sacred in all of its forms.

The second question is: At what moment does life begin?

There is only one moment in the full development of a full human being, and that is the moment of conception. The closest we can scientifically get to proof of that conception is the sound and the detection of that heartbeat, which we all recognize to be the sound of life. That sound of life, that beat of that heart cannot be extinguished by a moral human being who believes that a human life is sacred in all of its forms, and knows that it begins at the moment of conception. And then we can measure the heartbeat and protect that baby from the moment that that heart has begun to beat.

Any doctor that fails to follow the directive in this legislation, in H.R. 490, any doctor that fails to search for a heartbeat and conducts an abortion without—or conducts an abortion in spite of that beating heart is facing a fine and a prison term up to 5 years, or both.

That is a respect for human life. By the way, we hold the mother harmless. She is also protected from any touch of this law. It is only the abortionist that is the subject of this piece of legislation that I have introduced. But it aims to protect human life from at least the moment that the heartbeat can be detected; the baby is protected. And this will gain momentum as we go forward.

The American people will understand what this means. I am hopeful that across our churches, across our schools, across our families, they begin to talk about the Heartbeat Protection Act of 2017. And our little kids that grow up, as mine did—having once seen the film, that families grow up respecting the heartbeat of innocent, unborn human life.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention this evening. I yield back the balance of my time.

DISMANTLING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be with you this afternoon. I have a series of other speakers who will be joining me later in the hour from the Progressive Caucus, as we discuss some of the key events of the week from our perspective.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all the Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I love magic, and I bet a lot of people out there watching today love magic, too. Ever since I was a kid, I loved the cup tricks, the card tricks, and the rabbit coming out of the hat. When I was in college, I even used to entertain at elementary school birthday parties, helping to pay my way through college.

The key move in magic, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is the sleight of hand. I looked up the definition of "sleight of hand" in the Merriam-Webster Dictionary, which defines it as a cleverly executed deception.

A sleight of hand is also sometimes called a prestidigitation, quick fingers, or legerete de la main, which is the French phrase for "lightness of hand." It is defined as the set of closely related techniques used by a stage magician to manipulate the perceptions of the audience.

Sleight of hand depends on the use of psychology, careful stage misdirection, constant blabbering, and strategic confusion to distract the audience.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has been masterfully deploying sleight of hand ever since his inauguration. With his nonstop tweeting and his incessant mad antics, the President distracts us from the real action, which is what is happening here in Congress. We are witnessing a magic trick on the world's largest stage, the auditorium of American democracy. And we, the people, are the captive, bedazzled, and totally distracted audience of the President. The tweets are a massive sleight of hand distracting us from the serious destruction of public policy and law that is taking place right here in Congress.

□ 1700

I want to say, at the outset, I prefer to think of this as a magic trick because the alternative that the President simply can't control himself is almost too horrific to contemplate.

The Constitution does have a way of dealing with that problem, too, and you can find it in the 25th Amendment.

Today, we are going to assume that all of this is a magic show. I used to coach kids' soccer. And when I coached soccer, I would always tell the kids: Don't bunch. Keep your eye on the ball. Stay in your lane and pass the ball.

Without fail, the youngest kids who are just starting out, they all chase the ball. They move around the field in a big clump, a big mob. And I would say: Don't follow the mob that is following the ball. Go to where the ball is going to be going.

When they are young, they don't know how to do it.

I think that advice applies here as well to America, to the body politic. Don't follow the mob that is following the ball. Let's not be distracted full time by all the tomfoolery and tweetfoolery.

There are important and dangerous things happening right here in Congress right now. While the President is tweeting insults and fake news and inflating his slender college victory and the size of his inaugural crowd and making fun of Meryl Streep and chatting about Nordstrom's department store and talking about how he is going to make Mexico pay for his wall and so on, what is taking place in Congress is the systematic dismantling of the regulatory apparatus that the American public depends on for clean air, clean water, safe food, a decent environment, and control of criminality in the country.

The fundamental political action that we must be paying attention to now is the dismantling of the regulatory apparatus of the Federal Government, which is happening every day right here in the Halls of Congress. This is the apparatus that protects our food, our air, our water, our health care, our financial system, the ability of people to invest safely on Wall Street, occupational safety and health for our workers. All of this is being attacked in terrifying and often invisible ways.

Behind the scenes, while the wizard of odd convenes a dinner in Mar-a-Lago where he entertains a national security crisis discussion in full view of other diners who begin to tweet out and Facebook out what they are seeing happen, while all of that is happening, Congress is rolling back environmental protections to protect streams, rivers, and drinking water from pollution. They are savaging the rules that restrict the volume of greenhouse gas emissions that are leaked into the atmosphere, destabilizing our climate system. Check out H.J. Res. 38 and 36.

While the distractor in chief whines about leaks, while his whole campaign

was based on leaks of emails that were captured by Russian agents working to get him elected, in Congress, they are rolling back financial regulations which ensure that workers have retirement savings options, H.J. Res. 66, and which protect consumers from excessive financial risks, H.R. 78.

They have also targeted and rolled back labor regulations that promote safe and healthy workplaces and fair employment practices, H.J. Res. 37.

Amazingly, while President Trump's National Security Adviser, General Flynn, was forced to resign when it was revealed that he had been colluding with Russians to lift the sanctions that the Obama administration had imposed on Russia, here in Congress, we are passing joint resolutions to rescind anticorruption regulations that required oil and gas companies to report monetary payments that they made to foreign governments, H.J. Res. 41.

So Trump tweets about leaks, while his administration is one vast leak to the Russians. And here, Members of the GOP are working to throw an invisibility and secrecy cloak over corporate payments being made to foreign governments and corporations.

While the world is distracted by all of the sleight of hand, this Congress is passing bills to give government back to giant corporations and special interests that care not for the common good but simply for their own bottom line.

Mr. Speaker, as a freshman, I have been here for only 8 weeks. I have to tell you that I am disappointed that I have not voted on a single bill in the House Judiciary Committee that has had so much as a hearing. Yes, I want to repeat that. We have voted on five bills since I got here and not one of them has had a hearing.

Now, I come from the Maryland State Senate where I proudly served for 10 years as a State senator. When we had a bill coming up, no bill could be brought to the floor without a hearing first, and anybody who wanted to come testify on the bill could come testify on it. Now, that is not practicable here in the U.S. Congress. However, we could at least have experts relating to the bill and people who are affected by the bill come in and testify, but we haven't done that in the House Judiciary Committee. Instead, we voted on a series of bills which, to my mind, dramatically curtail the public interest.

Yesterday, we voted on a bill to dismantle, essentially to put into a stifling straightjacket, the class-action mechanism that has been used over the decades to vindicate the interest of people who are victims of sex discrimination, victims of race discrimination, victims of toxic torts, victims of asbestos poisoning. We voted basically to trash class action yesterday without even so much as a bill.

Now, on some of the other bills, it was said to me: Well, there were hearings in prior Congresses. One Member said: We had a hearing on that back in 2012.

This is 2017, 5 years later. But on this particular bill that I am talking about, nobody even heard the bill. There was no hearing on it. It was simply brought up for a vote. That is irresponsible legislation. That is not real democracy when you don't even have a hearing and people who are affected by the legislation don't have the opportunity to come and talk about it.

Now, they are not having hearings because they think—and they are probably right—we're not paying attention. What are we paying attention to? We are paying attention to the magician. We are paying attention to the wizard of odd. We are paying attention to the tweets instead.

The good news is that the audience is starting to wise up. The whole country is waking up to the profound dangers of the administration's financial and political entanglements with Russia, with the Russian corporate and governmental elite.

Just this week, the National Security Adviser, Mr. Flynn, resigned after reports came out about his communications with the Russian Ambassador while President Obama was still in office, communications dealing with the lifting of sanctions on Russia, communications that General Flynn lied about and was forced from office because of it. He misled Vice President MIKE PENCE and other officials about his conversations with the diplomat, which was being monitored and recorded by the intelligence community.

Now, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, my fellow Americans, let's think about this for a moment. As a former chief of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Mr. Flynn was no innocent about the world of spy versus spy. He must have known that his telephone call with the Russian Ambassador was being monitored and recorded. If he really wanted to go rogue and operate on his own without the permission and the license of President Trump, he never would have allowed that telephone conversation to be recorded. But he did allow it to be recorded. He made the call with presumable full knowledge that other people in the intelligence community would be listening in on it, which leads me to the inescapable, logical conclusion that Flynn knew that, in making that call, he enjoyed the full support of the one person above him who could remove him from his job, the President of the United States.

Now, do I know that? No, I don't know it. I surmise it. How are we going to know whether or not this is true? How do we get to the bottom of the Russian connection in the campaign? How do we get to the bottom of the Russian connection in the Trump administration?

We need to have a full, complete, independent investigation by experts, like the 9/11 Commission, which gets to the bottom of this profound danger, this dagger pointed at the throat of American democracy.

Mr. Speaker, everybody loves magic, I think. Everybody loves the enchantment of being fooled, of being distracted, of being diverted. That is why people go to magic shows. It is diverting. It is amusing. It is fun.

Everybody loves a great magician, too. None was greater in our history than the great Houdini, who dazzled the world with his extraordinary optical illusions and effects, his amazing ability to simulate telepathy and telekinesis.

Houdini also had a very strong ethical and professional code about being a magician. He never revealed a trick. More importantly, he never tried to fool people in order to defraud them. He never tried to fool people in order to humiliate them. He never tried to fool people in order to take away their rights. He never tried to fool people in order to demoralize and crush them or to strip them of their freedom. He never tried to fool people in order to victimize them.

Indeed, in the 1920s, Mr. Houdini channeled all of his magnificent energy away from doing his magic shows and instead put it into the separate but related task of exposing psychics, mediums, con men, charlatans, and practitioners of the occult and the dark arts who did take advantage of people's good will, who did take advantage of people's impressionability to defraud them, to take their money, their belongings, and to distract them from the real world, and to undermine the moral and ethical principles that should govern human behavior and must govern social life.

Although Houdini is no longer with us, he has great heirs today in socially responsible magicians like the Amazing Randi and Penn & Teller.

Already millions of Americans themselves—millions of us in the audience—have woken up to the fact that we have been pulled into an irrational and dangerous fantasy world, an echo chamber of malignant narcissism, cruelty, and paranoia.

It is time for all of us to stop being distracted, to stop being bedazzled, and pay attention to the real game, which is, one, trying to get America to join with Vladimir Putin, a dictator and an autocrat who said that the single greatest catastrophe of the 20th century was the dissolution of the Soviet Union, in order to create an international league of dictators, demagogues, and despots to violate human rights and crush liberal democracy; and, two, to dismantle at home the public regulatory infrastructure which protects our land, our air, our water, our climate, our liberties, our freedoms, our equal rights, and our capacity to function as the greatest democracy on Earth and to function as an efficient and effective government meeting the needs of the people.

The magicians out there—there aren't many—but you have a special obligation to help us blow the whistle, and you are doing it. But it is really

the American people—it is all of us who must stand up.

The Constitution talks about three branches of government. Article I is Congress. Article II is the executive. Article III is the judiciary. Let's call Congress the first branch.

But when you think about it, what is even more important than the Congress is the trunk, the roots of democracy. Everything grows up from the people. The branches are out there, but Congress works for the people. The President works for Congress and the people. The Supreme Court and the judiciary work for the people.

It is time for the people to dissolve the spells that have been cast over the country, to say this is a democracy. We operate by the Constitution and the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate participating in this Special Order hour about things that, I think, the American people really ought to be caring about.

The minute that Donald Trump took the oath of office and put his hand in the air, he was in violation of the law. It is just a fact that the Trump Hotel, which is in the old post office building—there is a very explicit contract that says no elected official may enter into a contract for that hotel and profiting from the business in that hotel. There was a lawsuit that was filed. It is still pending.

You may not think that is a really big deal, but how about this: What if there were delegations from somewhere else in the world, some country that really wanted to curry favor with the United States of America, and decided a really good way to do it would be to move our delegation to stay at the Trump Hotel?

□ 1715

Maybe we could have a big gala, we could have a party, and we could make a lot of money from that. And guess what. Maybe the President of the United States would notice that we are spending money in a hotel from which he gains a profit, and that would be a really swell idea.

Well, actually, the Framers of the Constitution thought that was not such a grand idea and very explicitly put into the Constitution something that would prohibit any foreign government from influencing U.S. policy. They were worried about the King of England. They were worried about France. They were worried about other countries having too much influence on the United States by currying favor with the President and the decision-makers, and so they introduced and put into the Constitution very explicitly what they called the Emoluments Clause in Article I, section 9 of the Constitution.

While “emoluments” is certainly not a word we use in regular conversa-

tions—emoluments, I never used it before this and never heard of it before this, actually—it is a concept that is part of our Constitution, and it is very simple: that no government official should receive benefits of any kind—of any kind—from a foreign government. President Trump is clearly violating that constitutional principle.

So, unlike any Presidents before him, President Trump has actually refused to fully separate himself and his family from his business dealings. It is also very unusual, of course, that we haven't seen his tax returns, which has been pretty standard for any President to release his tax returns, and it has been a requirement for the Cabinet that Mr. Trump has exacted from those nominees.

Because of his business holdings, Trump and his family are constantly—constantly—receiving benefits from other countries, whether it is foreign governments renting that space at the Trump Hotel in D.C. or the loans and business agreements that the Trump organization has with China, Russia, and many other countries. We don't know them all. We haven't seen them all. That would be in his tax returns and all the different sections of the tax return, his holdings in Saudi Arabia, and Turkey, which he has refused to put into a blind trust.

So it is troubling enough that President Trump and his family are profiting off the Presidency, but now it is becoming clearer that this lack of ethics could threaten our national security and national interests. So if you haven't cared until now, you ought to start caring.

Look at Russia. Trump has done business in Russia and has remained uncomfortably close to Vladimir Putin. He refuses to release his tax returns, which could clarify the specific financial interests that he has in Russia.

President Trump knew his National Security Adviser, Michael Flynn, was compromised by Russian intelligence and had misled Vice President PENCE; yet Flynn was allowed to remain in one of our most sensitive national security positions until criticism from Congress, the media, and the public became too much to ignore.

President Trump continues to gloss over the serious problems that led to Flynn's resignation. Instead, he attacks the messenger and the leaks that brought Flynn's conduct to light. These are bright red flags. These are signs that the President has something to hide.

Americans deserve a President who they can trust is putting the country's interests ahead of his own, that he is putting the country's interests instead of another country's interests because that deal might be in his interest.

There should be no question over the purity of the President's motives, especially when he is making critical security decisions on behalf of the Nation. If President Trump wants to assure the American people that he deserves our

trust, he must be transparent. We need a bipartisan, independent investigation of his conflicts of interest, particularly with Russia, but not exclusively. He must release his tax returns, and he must fully separate himself from his business dealings.

The corrupt practices of this administration must stop. Our country and our Constitution demand nothing less.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), my good friend, the Assistant Democratic Leader.

HONORING VOORHEES COLLEGE AND DENMARK
TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to continue honoring HBCUs, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, for their significant contributions to our Nation's history.

While only 3 percent of our Nation's higher education institutions are Historically Black, HBCUs produce 20 percent of the African-American college graduates. Today, I recognize and celebrate two of the seven HBCUs in my congressional district, Voorhees College and Denmark Technical College, both in Denmark, South Carolina.

Voorhees College was founded as Denmark Industrial School in 1897 by Elizabeth Evelyn Wright when she was just 23 years old. Wright studied at Tuskegee Institute and was a devotee of Booker T. Washington. She had previously led efforts to start schools for African Americans in South Carolina, which were always met with arson and threats of violence. She persisted in her efforts to offer African Americans an opportunity for a better life and, with Voorhees, created an institution that would stand the test of time.

Wright originally taught classes in an old store in Denmark, but, in 1902, New Jersey philanthropist Ralph Voorhees donated money to purchase land and construct a building for the school. A high school at first, Voorhees offered classes at this level for African Americans in the area.

In 1924, the Episcopal Church partnered with Voorhees, and an affiliation with that church continues to this day. The college began to offer junior college degrees in 1947 and 4-year degrees in 1962. While originally founded on the principles of Booker T. Washington to teach job and trade skills to African Americans, Voorhees now proudly claims to offer a blend of Washington's philosophy and that of W. E. B. Du Bois, who believed a classical liberal arts education was vital to the development of African Americans.

The college's recently retired president, Dr. Cleveland Sellers, is a Denmark native who graduated from Voorhees High School. Sellers went on to Howard University, where he became active with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, participating in its 1966 March against Fear.

In 1968, after returning to South Carolina, Sellers was arrested and imprisoned for supposedly inciting the confrontation between students and po-

lice that became known as the Orangeburg massacre, when police opened fire on students, killing 3 and injuring 27.

Voorhees' College's new president, Dr. W. Franklin Evans, previously served as interim president of my alma mater, South Carolina State. In that role, he successfully led South Carolina State out of a financial crisis. I sincerely believe that Voorhees College is well-positioned for the future with Dr. Evans at its helm.

Denmark Technical College, whose campus is adjacent to Voorhees, was originally a branch of the South Carolina Trade School System. It was created in 1948 by the South Carolina General Assembly and mandated to provide trade skills to African Americans. During the "separate but equal" era, Denmark Tech was one of the few opportunities for trade school education offered to African Americans by the State.

In the early 1960s, Governor Fritz Hollings and then-Senator John West led the effort to create the South Carolina Technical College System. In 1969, the existing trade school in Denmark was transferred into the system and the modern Denmark Technical College was created. Its total enrollment is approximately 2,000, 96 percent of whom are minority students. Denmark Tech continues to provide technical education and trade skills in its assigned region of Bamberg, Barnwell, and Allendale Counties.

Voorhees College and Denmark Technical College, like their fellow HBCUs, have made an indelible impact on their communities, South Carolina, and the Nation. They have provided generations of African Americans educational opportunities, and I look forward to their continued success.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, we should be joined momentarily by Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE. I want to close out, though, my own thoughts by responding to something I have been hearing over the last week here in the Halls of Congress.

Now that it is clear from our intelligence agencies, 16 of them, including the CIA, the FBI, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and so on, that Vladimir Putin had a deliberate campaign of espionage, cyber sabotage, propaganda, and fake news to undermine American democracy in the 2016 election, and now that it is clear that there were high-level contacts between Trump associates and officials of the Russian Government, it is no longer being denied by anybody on either side of the aisle. What I have started to hear is, well, sure, they tried to hack our election, and, sure, they leaked thousands of emails, and, sure, they changed the dynamics of the campaign and what people were talking about in the campaign, but there is no proof that they stuffed any ballot boxes or they hacked into the computers. And that is true; we don't know that they stuffed any ballot boxes or hacked into computers,

and we will have to see if anything comes out about that when we finally get to do a real comprehensive investigation. But, Mr. Speaker, the reality is that we should be terrified and appalled and outraged that they were allowed to go as far as they did.

How many people in this body would accept a foreign entity coming into our congressional districts and spending millions or hundreds of thousands of dollars against us, hacking into our computers, releasing our emails, and completely changing the dynamics of the campaign?

So when I hear from colleagues that, well, yes, they distorted the campaign, they hacked into the campaign, but they didn't steal the election, I think that they are making a distinction with no difference at all. If you derail the campaign, you kidnap the campaign, you hijack the campaign, you have altered the outcome of the election, especially one in which your opponent gets 2.9 million votes more than you did, especially in an election where you were able to torture out only the slenderest of electoral college victories in three States by 70,000 votes.

□ 1730

So I simply reject the constant claim that I am hearing from colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that we don't need to worry about Russian subversion of the 2016 election because it only affected the campaign; it didn't necessarily affect the election outcome. To influence the campaign is to influence the election outcome.

Mr. Speaker, I am seeing Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE is not here, so I yield back the balance of my time.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we see so much on TV. I was watching the President's press conference a little while ago. We see so much discord out there, and this opportunity that we have in the afternoon to really delve deep into the issues is so valuable to me. It is one of the only opportunities that the American people get to see us delving deeply into the issues.

You and I know that we are in the committee room, we are behind closed doors in a bipartisan way grappling with all of the hardest issues that face American families, but folks don't see it and they don't feel it. Why it is we celebrate the discord instead of celebrating the discourse is a mystery to me.

I bring, Mr. Speaker, today some stories about the Affordable Care Act from my district at home. It is not going to be a surprise to you that these are stories of challenges.

In Cumming, Georgia—it is up in Forsyth County, Georgia, just north of